DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL



JEB BUSH Governor

FRANK BROGAN Lieutenant Governor

KIMBERLY BAHRAMI Chief Information Officer

STATE OF FLORIDA

STATE TECHNOLOGY OFFICE

4030 Fsplanade Way, Suite 180 • Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0950



MyFlorida.com

February 27,2003

FCC - MAILROOM

Honorable Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary c/o Vistronix, Inc. 236 Massachusetts Ave. N.E., Suite 110 Washington, DC 20002

FILED VIA E-MAIL 2/27/03

RE: Comments Responding to FCC 02-329, Report & Order & Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Issued December 13, 2002, in FCC Docket Nos. 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170

Dear Secretary Dortch:

As the Enterprise Information Solutions Officer over the state government telecommunications network, I am writing on behalf of Florida's State Technology Office to provide comments in response to FCC Order 02-329, issued on December 13, 2002, in the dockets listed above.

Chapter 282, Florida Statutes, assigns the State Technology Office (STO) with he responsibility for developing and maintaining the SUNCOM Network as he state communications system. SUNCOM has existed under Florida law since 1975. SUNCOM provides local and long distance telecommunications service to a large customer base that includes state agencies, universities, community colleges, libraries, local governments, school districts, and certain ion-profit corporations (including private universities and health care providers).

The basis for filing STO comments is to seek clarification and support the continuation of the current practice that allows local exchange companies to harge Centrex customers for universal service contributions using a ratio of me ninth of the rate charged to PBX trunks. This "Centrex equivalency ratio" nethod established by the FCC is a fair and reasonable way to address the ifference in the two technologies in that a single PBX truck supports multiple nes behind the PBX. The potential for changing this previously approved ractice causes great concern for this office due to the financial impact to our tate customers and the public funds supporting those customers.

No. of Contag rec'd ()

Honorable Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Page 2 February 27,2003

Utilizing the services of three primary service providers (BellSouth, Sprint, and Verizon), the STO maintains over 200 Centrex systems with an estimated 200,000 lines statewide for the customer base described above in the second paragraph. In addition, there are certain agencies that individually procure Centrex systems from other service providers based on large volume requirements in remote locations (e.g., correctional facilities). If the effect of FCC Order 02-329 nullifies the existing ability of these local exchange companies to assess a one-ninth equivalency ratio for universal service charges on Centrex lines, the estimated financial impact on all these state Centrex systems will be **about one million dollars** (see attached spreadsheet for fiscal impact **to** the State Technology Office systems).

Representing the interests of our State customers, the State Technology Office strongly urges the FCC to uphold the current practice of the one-ninth ratio for Centrex stations (versus PBX trunks) for the collection of universal service contributions. In these times fraught with tremendous budget reductions, the discontinuation of the "Centrex equivalency ratio" practice would have a profoundly adverse effect on our state government Centrex users. As the estimated impact demonstrates, the State's Centrex users would be unfairly burdened doling out a disproportionate amount of dollars toward universal service contributions. For this reason, we encourage the Federal Communications Commission to provide clarification and support the current industry practice of utilizing the "Centrex equivalency ratio" method that was originally devised by the FCC to maintain a "level playing field" for Centrex and PBX services.

Sincerely,

John C. Ford

Enterprise Information Solutions Officer

JCF:WEP:cm

Attachment to State of Florida Comments Responding to FCC 02-329, Report & Order & Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Issued December 13,2002, in FCC Docket Nos. 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170

Vendor	Cost per line	Line Count	Cost per month	Estimated cost per year at current rate	ESTIMATED COST PER YEAR AT PROPOSED RATE	DIFFERENCE
BellSouth	\$0.06	85000	\$5,100.00	\$61,200.00	\$550,800.00	\$489,600.00
Verizon	\$0.07	35380	\$2,476.60	\$29,719.20	\$229,262.40	\$199,543.20
Sprint	\$0.50	80000	\$40,000.00	\$480,000.00	\$518,400.00	\$38,400.00
Totals		200380	\$47,576.60	\$570,919.20	\$1,298,462.40	\$727,543.20